

Witness called and duly sworn on: 03.12.2025

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. JSK LEARNED COUNSEL FOR
RESPONDENT NO.4:

1. After the accident I was taken to Govt. Hospital, Beguru where I took first aid and thereafter I was admitted to JSS Hospital, Mysuru. At JSS Hospital I was treated by Dr. Sri. Siddalingamurthy. I have even undergone surgery. Witness states that one other doctor has also treated me but I do not recollect his name.

2. Except for the medical records and bills already got exhibited by me I have no other bills or records available with me. I have studied 1st year B.A but I have not completed course as I got a job. I have retired from the police department around 5 years back. I am getting Rs.40,000/- per month as pension. I have a S/B account at SBI. I do not have any document regarding my other sources of income mentioned by me in my petition.

3. I own 3 and half acres of land and the same is standing in my name. I am cultivating coconut crops in my land. I have employed one labor to look after the coconut plantation. There are around 250 coconut trees in my land. I get coconut yield once in 3 to 4 months. About 3 months back I got around 2000 coconuts from my land. It is false to suggest that the bills got exhibited by me at Sl. No.21, 25 and 28 of Ex.P8 series are all receipts issue for having paid advance amount at the Hospital. I possessed a valid and subsisting D.L. My date of birth is 15.04.1960. No doctor has issued any disability certificate to me.

4. The accident occurred on a national highway. It is true to suggest that generally vehicles ply at a high speed on national highway. It is true to suggest that the car first hit an auto which came from a cross road and thereafter dashed against me. Witness states that the car just brushed the auto and directly came and dashed against me. I do not know if the auto which was involved in the accident was not insured at the time of accident and similarly it did not have a valid fitness certificate. I am aware that the registration number of the auto KA-10-3328. It is true to suggest that the said vehicle is a goods auto.

5. It is false to suggest that as the documents pertaining to the auto were not in order, apprehending that if the charge sheet is filed against driver of the auto I would not get compensation, the police twisted the actual facts to project as if the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of driver of the car bearing No.KA-41-MD-0008. It is false to suggest that there was no negligence on the part of driver of the car bearing No.KA-41-MD-0008.

6. It is false to suggest that I have fully recovered from the injuries sustained in the accident. Witness states that I have not recovered fully instead I still have issues due to injuries sustained in the accident. I have documents to show that I have consulted doctors for follow up treatment with respect to injuries sustained by me in the accident even after being discharged from the Hospital.

7. It is false to suggest that as there was no negligence on the part of driver of the car, the respondent No.4 company is not liable to pay any compensation to me. I have no impediment to procure the copy of the insurance policy pertaining to the car as on the date of accident from the I.O. and produce the same before this court.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

**Prl.Judge ,
Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru**